

N60200.AR.009051
NAS CECIL FIELD
5090.3a

LETTER FROM FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION REGARDING
TECHNICAL REVIEW OF FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY SITE 11 OPERABLE UNIT 6 (OU6)
WITH ATTACHMENT NAS CECIL FIELD FL
11/23/1993
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



Lawton Chiles
Governor

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Twin Towers Office Building
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400

Virginia B. Wetherell
Secretary

4,6,444

Received
12-6-93

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

November 23, 1993

Mr. David Criswell
Southern Division Naval Facilities
Engineering Command
2155 Eagle Drive
North Charleston, SC 29418

Dear Mr. Criswell:

Department personnel have completed the technical review of the Focused Feasibility Study for Site 11. Operable Unit 6, NAS Cecil Field. I have enclosed memoranda addressed to me from Mr. Michael Deliz and Mr. Tim Larson. They document our comments on the referenced report.

If I can be of any further assistance with this matter, please contact me at 904-488-0190.

Sincerely,

Eric S. Nuzie
Federal Facilities Coordinator

ESN/mjd

Enclosure

cc: Michael Deliz -
John Mitchell, FDEP
James Hudson, USEPA
John Dingwall, NAS Cecil Field
Basir Ghorri, NAS Cecil Field
Jerry Young, City of Jacksonville

Florida Department of
Environmental Protection

Memorandum

TO: Eric S. Nuzie, Federal Facilities Coordinator
Bureau of Waste Cleanup

THROUGH: Dr. James J. Crane, Administrator *JJC*
Technical Review Section

Jorge R. Caspary, P.G., Professional Geologist I *JRC.*
Technical Review Section

FROM: Michael J. Deliz, P.G., Technical Review Section *myS*
Bureau of Waste Cleanup

DATE: November 22, 1993

SUBJECT: Focused Feasibility Study Site 11, Operable Unit 6,
Source Control Remedial Alternatives
Naval Air Station Cecil Field
Jacksonville, Florida

Mr. Tim Larson of Engineering Support and I have completed the review of the Focused Feasibility Study, dated October, 1993 (received October 25, 1993), submitted for the above-referenced facility. Mr. Larson's memorandum is attached and I have the following comments:

1. What was the electromagnetic survey's (EM) grid spacing over the site? Could the documented forty (40) foot by forty (40) pit with hundreds of pesticide containers have been missed by the EM survey?
2. It is recommended that the historical evidence/interviews regarding the origin of the documented forty (40) foot by forty (40) foot pit with hundreds of pesticide containers be further investigated.

Memorandum

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

TO: Eric Nuzie
Technical Review Section

FROM: Tim R. Larson *TR*
Engineering Support Section

DATE: November 2, 1993

RE: Focused Feasibility Study
NAS Cecil Field Site 11, Operable Unit 6
Jacksonville, Florida

The above referenced document has been reviewed. The following comments are in response to that review.

The alternatives in the above referenced document is, in general, common options at hazardous waste sites. Options 3, 4, and 5 are all very close in cost as presented. Options 1 and 2 are much more expensive and should be ruled out of further evaluation. Options 3 and 4 which both propose treatment of debris, on-site and off-site respectively, should be cautiously considered. Both options appear to underestimate the cost of debris treatment or don't show the cost as in Option 4. The treatment of debris by pressure washing may not achieve acceptable standards and may still have to be handled as a hazardous waste and it is unlikely that it would only cost \$1500.00.

In summary, Options 3, 4, and 5 are acceptable, but Option 5 offers the least degree of risk in meeting standards and in the potential for 'change orders' when the project is put out to bid. Option 3 and 4 may require debris treatment technology evaluation whereas Option 5 would not. If Option 5 is determined to be the appropriate option the next submittal should be a final design report.

TRL/ww